

Application No. 10/528,638

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application is respectfully requested. Claims 3, 10, 11, and 17 have been amended herein, and claims 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 17, 19, and 21-22 remain pending in the above-referenced application.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication on page 4 of the outstanding Office Action that claims 3-6, 8-13, 17, 19, and 21-22 would be allowable if amended or rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Applicants have amended the claims in an effort to correct a few minor informalities, which is detailed further below. Accordingly, all pending claims should be considered allowable.

***Objections to the Claims***

The Examiner objected to claims 3-6, 8-13, 17, 19, and 21-22 because claims 3, 10, and 17 recited the terms "the substrate at" and "the substrate is" instead of "the substrates at" and "the substrates are". Claims 3, 10, and 17 have been amended according to the Examiner's helpful suggestions, and, as such, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

In addition, the pending claims have been amended in an effort to place them into proper form for U.S. patent practice. These amendments have not been made to overcome any prior art and do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Application No. 10/528,638

***Rejections under 35 USC § 112***

The Examiner rejected claims 3-6, 8-13, 17, 19, and 21-22 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 10 as being indefinite because the claims are directed toward alternatives of processing units and control units, and, because a literal reading of the claim language would enable a mixing of the two alternatives (i.e., the apparatus could comprise control units, but also have a timing device corresponding to a processing time of the processing units). Claims 3 and 10 have been amended to clearly indicate that features of the claims with respect to the alternatives of the processing units and the control units are now determined according to the type of unit present in the apparatus and method of claims 3 and 10, respectively. Therefore, the possibility that features could correspond to the first alternative when the second alternative is present, or vice versa, has been eliminated.

Further, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 17 as lacking antecedent basis for "process time", due to the fact that the preamble of the claim only recites a curing device in which the adhesive is cured. The term "process time" is first recited with respect to the "curing device having a process time." The Applicants have amended claims 10 and 17 to recite "a curing device having a process time for curing the adhesive", in order to clearly define the claimed process time as corresponding to the time for curing the adhesive by the curing device.

Further, claim 17 has been amended according to the Examiner's helpful suggestion, wherein the phrase "at least the curing device" has been amended to recite "the curing device".

Application No. 10/528,638

As such, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of the pending claims with respect to 35 USC §112.

Application No. 10/528,638

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 12 2010****CONCLUSION**


Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Martin R. Geissler, Applicants' Attorney at 1.703.621.7140 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3828 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

**Date: January 12, 2010**

Respectfully Submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Martin R. Geissler  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 51011

Muncy, Geissler, Olds & Lowe, PLLC  
PO BOX 1364  
Fairfax, VA 22038-1364  
Tel. 1.703.621.7140